



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Aesthetischer Kommentar zur Odyssee. Von KARL ALTENDORF.
Giessen: Emil Roth, 1904. Pp. 79. M. 1.50.

Believing that disintegrating criticism has failed to solve the problem of Homeric authorship, Altendorf tries to re-establish belief in the unity of the *Odyssey* by arguments applying to it as a whole and in detail. His argument is: "The kernel of the *Odyssey* is the return and revenge of Odysseus, but we could have little interest in this without previous knowledge of the hero, and to obtain this we should hear the story of his wanderings from his own lips. We can not hear this after his return, as other events crowd in; hence some place must be found before he reaches Ithaca, and so the necessity for the dialogue of Alcinous. But no mere stranger could have claimed the attention of the Phaeacians for so long a story, hence he must have done something extraordinary to arouse their interest, just such exploits are the theme of Books vii-viii; while v and vi are necessary to bring him to the palace of Alcinous where his story may be told. Without the first four books the *Odyssey* would begin with a hero in whom our interest had not been aroused and also the action would have come to a standstill at the outset. The *Telemacheia* is necessary to give us sufficient interest to follow Odysseus in his wanderings and sympathy in his struggles at his return. After the victory over the suitors, it is necessary to know the final settlement, and our interest has so often been drawn to Laertes that we must see him with his son again; so the final books of the *Odyssey* are necessary. Hence the *Odyssey* is one single creation, each part related closely with the whole, and all the work of a single poet. Certain small additions are to be detected, such as the end of the last book.

Having shown that the poem taken as a whole is a unit, Altendorf defends suspected passages in detail. Four illustrations give an idea of the nature of his arguments: The objection urged against Book i, that so many verses are found in other books, is not proof of the imitator or plagiarist, since such people never fail in ability to compose verses. Their weakness is in ideas, and they would certainly have changed the form of the verses they were imitating. It is the creator who can quote himself without change. The fact that the verses are identical is proof rather of identity of authorship than of the copyist. Answering the criticism that Odysseus is too prolix in his speech to Nausicaa in vi, Altendorf says: "He had at this moment nothing with which to make an impression but words, and words must cover his nakedness and furnish him speech besides." To the objection that Telemachus is called a man in xi. 184 and 449, he replies: "The details are of small moment, the identity of character is the important thing, since it is a rule of poetry that the age of individual characters should change but little, else the poetry would lose unity and interest. Hence the only conclusions to draw from this slip in

historical perspective is that this Telemachus is the creation of the same poet who conceived the *Telemacheia*."

The spirit of the author is best shown in a comment to xv. 401 ff. After noticing the difficulties of the passage he adds: "When I had thus expressed myself, I took up the book and read the story again in a receptive, sympathetic mood, and I felt myself so thoroughly under the sway of the earnest and sublime spirit of Homer that I was half-ashamed that I had ever doubted. This Homeric spell is the highest proof." Such an argument is very different from the current ones, but I am glad to see a scholar bold enough to use it. The book is most stimulating and is written with a high appreciation of Homeric poetry.

JOHN A. SCOTT

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

A History of Thessaly, from the Earliest Historical Times to the Accession of Philip V of Macedonia. By ROLAND G. KENT. Pennsylvania dissertation, printed in part: Chapter V (From the Persian Wars to Lycophron of Pherae) and Appendices I and II. Privately printed, 1904. Pp. viii+27.

Some marginal distortion is probably inevitable when the lens of the historian is fixed steadily upon the central figures in a given epoch; and such a work as Dr. Kent's has its use in restoring the proper outlines to the edges of the picture. To intrinsic interest it can make little claim—an almost necessary consequence of the fragmentary and incidental manner in which the history of Thessaly has been preserved. If one may judge the whole investigation by the specimen offered, the author has given a clear and trustworthy history of the country down to the limit chosen, and has here and there corrected a prevailing misapprehension. For example, in Appendix II he combats, with much reason, the assumption of Busolt and others that the friendly relations between Thessaly and Athens during the Peloponnesian War were brought about by the influence of a popular party in the former country, ascribing them rather to the temporary ascendancy of an oligarchic faction friendly to Athens. This view is strengthened, perhaps, by a passage that Mr. Kent does not use, Thuc. iv. 132, whence it appears that when Perdiccas allied himself with Athens, in 423, he prevented a Spartan advance through Thessaly by means of the influence of his Thessalian friends, undoubtedly aristocrats. Appendix I is an attempt to reconstruct the stemmata of the ruling families of Pharsalus.

CAMPBELL BONNER

PEABODY COLLEGE FOR TEACHERS
Nashville, Tenn.